DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 866 JC 940 586

TITLE	Pennsylvania College of Technology Non-Returning Student (Leaver) Survey Report, Spring 1992 to Fall 1992.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania Coll. of Technology, Williamsport.
PUB DATE	Jun 93
NOTE	50p.; Cover title: "Spring 1992-Fall 1992 Leaver Survey Report."
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Persistence; Community Colleges; *Dropout Characteristics; Dropout Research; *Dropouts; Education Work Relationship; Outcomes of Education; Salaries; *School Holding Power; Student Attitudes; *Student Attrition; Student Behavior; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	Pennsylvania College of Technology

ABSTRACT

To determine factors influencing attrition and retention at Pennsylvania College of Technology, a survey was conducted of the 767 students who were enrolled in spring 1992 but neither graduated nor enrolled in fall 1992. Study findings, based on responses from 373 former students, included the following: (1) only 11% of the minority non-returners responded to the survey, compared to 50% of the white leavers, while financially disadvantaged students and students with low grade point averages were also underrepresented in the sample; (2) 31% of the respondents indicated preparation for a first job as their primary objective in enrolling; (3) 26% of the respondents left to attend another college, while 24% cited tuition and costs as a reason for leaving; (4) 14% cited personal and family problems as their primary reason for leaving; (5) respondents gave a 3.14 rating out of 4 to their overall educational experience, while instructional quality was rated at 3.37; (6) only 38% of the leavers were employed full-time, compared to 62% in a 1987 survey; (7) the average salary for full-time employed leavers was $18,780; and (8) the number of leavers who transferred was 35%, the highest in 10 years. Data tables are included. The survey instrument and cover letters are appended. (KP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 376 866

Institutional Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Cunningham

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1992

Pennsylvania College of Technology

Formerly The Williamsport Area Community College

PENNSTATE

JC 940 586

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
NON-RETURNING STUDENT
(LEAVER) SURVEY REPORT:
SPRING 1992 TO FALL 1992

A vital component in the success of any higher education institution is the design of strategies for recruiting and subsequently retaining the changing population of prospective college students. To accomplish these objectives, it is very important to identify and analyze the reasons why students choose to enroll as degree-seeking students at Pennsylvania College of Technology, but then discontinue their enrollment without successfully completing their program of study.

In order to determine the factors responsible for attrition and retention between the Spring and Fall 1992 semesters at Pennsylvania College of Technology, the Non-Returner (Leaver) Survey was sent to the identified non-returning population. The following is a report of the results of the ninth Leaver study. This information is designed to meet the needs of the College as well as providing a data base for government mandated information. The report is presented in five sections:

CONTENTS — PAGE NUMBER

A.	Purpose	1
B.	Analysis and Findings	2
C.	Procedures and Data Preparation	10
D.	Tables	13
E.	Appendices	39

A. PURPOSE

1.) To present a composite profile of those students who do not complete their program of study at the College.

2.) To identify reasons why students leave Pennsylvania College of Technology.

3.) To obtain information from non-returning students regarding their degree of satisfaction with the College.

4.) To determine the current employment status of the non-returners.

5.) To contribute information to the program evaluation system.

6.) To provide a data base for analysis of the attrition/retention phenomenon at the College.

****

For the purpose of definition, "Non-Returners" or "Leavers" are considered to be any degree seeking students officially enrolled in the Spring semester who did not graduate and did not officially enroll the following Fall semester. Students who were terminated by the College for academic or administrative reasons are not included in the Leaver survey population, because they are ineligible to return. Beginning this year, students who officially withdrew voluntarily are included in the survey population.

****

B. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Following are the major findings of the study, in two parts: general information and demographics, and the survey responses. They do not represent all possible inferences that can be drawn from the data, Therefore, the reader is encouraged to examine both the tables presented following this section, as well as the previous Leaver reports. The source data and computer output are available for review in the Office of Strategic Planning & Research.

GENERAL INFORMATION AND DEMOGRAPHICS (Tables 1-9)

Twenty-eight demographic variables were used to perform two major comparisons: non-returners vs. returners and survey respondents vs. non-respondents. The first comparison analyzed differences between non-graduating students enrolled in the Spring semester who returned in the Fall and those who didn't, thereby identifying potential high-risk characteristics associated with attrition. The second comparison analyzed differences between the survey respondents and non-respondents to determine if the respondents were representative of the entire non-returning population, thereby allowing survey results to be generalized for the entire population.

Non-Returners vs. Returners

For the second straight year, Spring to Fall retention improved, from 69% in 1990 to 71% last year and 72% in 1992 (2452 of 3420 non-graduating Spring semester students returning for the Fall semester, p. 15).

Over the past decade of this survey, several student traits have consistently been identified, by statistical tests of significance (*), as being strongly related to the probability of returning. These traits include race, residency, family income, high school rank, educational goal, application reason, curriculum, expected employment status, accumulated credits, credit load and grade point average (GPA).

(*) Whenever the term "significant" is used in this analysis, it refers to the results of statistical tests of significance, with a 5% significance level.

For the first time financial disadvantaged status and educational disadvantaged status were found to be strongly related to retention. For the first time in five years, age was not related to retention. It is obviously important to keep these characteristics in mind, both in identifying probable leavers before they leave and in developing strategies to retain them.

Race - Minority students remain significantly less likely to return than white students (62% - 72%).

Residence - Students from Lycoming County again had significantly lower retention rates than others. However, retention of Lycoming County students has consistently improved from 62% in 1988 to 68% in 1992.

Family Income - As in the past, income is significantly related to retention. Students reporting family incomes under $12,000 were much less likely to return than those with incomes over $30,000 (67% - 75%). This is probably somewhat related to residence, as local students generally have lower incomes than those from outside the area.

Financially Disadvantaged Status - Consistent with family income, students identified as financially disadvantaged were also less likely to return (70% - 73%).

Educationally Disadvantaged Status - Students identified as educationally disadvantaged were also significantly less likely to return (69% - 74%).

High School Rank - Related to educational disadvantaged students, those ranked in the bottom third of their high school class were again significantly less likely to return (70%) than those in the top third (80%).

Educational Goal - Students who enroll intending to transfer to a four-year college (65%) or out of personal interest (67%) are significantly less likely to return than others (75%). Educational goals are probably also interrelated with residency, as local students more often enroll for transfer or personal reasons.

Application Reason - Students who choose the College for convenience or low cost were significantly less likely to return (68%) than those who applied due to program choice (74%).

Curriculum/Division - Students in the non-technical programs are significantly less likely to return than others: Integrated Studies - 59%, Business/Computer - 68%, North Campus - 68% (Table 1A, p. 13). Those from the more technical divisions are substantially more likely to return: Construction/Design - 78%, Health Science - 80%, Industrial/ Engineering - 79%, Natural Resource/ Transportation - 75%. Once more this is related to residency, as non-technical programs draw more local students and technical students tend to come from outside the area.

Expected Employment Status - Students who had expected to be employed over ten hours a week while enrolled had significantly lower retention rates than others (70% - 74%). Survey results show that expected employment while in college is highly correlated to actual employment.

Accumulated Credits - Non-returners generally have either very few credits or are close to graduating. Students who earned 21 to 50 credits had a significantly higher retention rate (80%) than those with less than 21 (58%) or over 50 credits (62%).

Spring Credit Load - On average, non-returners attempt significantly fewer credits in the Spring semester than those who return (11.8 - 13.2). Specifically, those attempting 15 credits or less have much lower retention rates (67%) than those with over 15 credits (81%), implying that part-time students are higher risks to drop out. Once more, this coincides with residency, as most part-timers are local students.

Grade Point Average (GPA) - As to be expected, non-returner GPAs are significantly lower than those of returning students (cumulative: 2.65 - 2.86, semester: 2.55 - 2.79).

Demographics bearing no significant relationship to retention include: gender, age, high school major, handicapped status, non-traditional gender program, parental educational levels, family size, college experience and Penn College experience within the family, and applications and acceptances to other colleges.

Survey Respondents vs. Non-Respondents

The overall survey response rate was 48.6% (373 of 767 leavers). Survey respondents and non-respondents (excluding terminated students) were compared to determine if the respondents were representative of the entire leaver population. Several major differences were noted between leavers who responded to the survey and those who did not.

Race - Minority students responded at a significantly lower rate than white students (11% - 50%, p. 21).

Financially Disadvantaged Status - Students identified as financially disadvantaged responded at a significantly lower rate than others (41% - 56%).

Grade Point Average - On average, non-respondents had significantly lower GPAs than others (cumulative: 2.56 - 2.74; semester: 2.44 - 2.66). Specifically, those with GPAs under 2.5 were much less likely to respond than others (cumulative: 40% - 56%; semester: 44% - 54%, p. 22-23).

Survey results which are found to be significantly related to the variables noted above are biased responses which cannot be considered to be totally accurate measures of the entire leaver population and will be so noted. With the exception of those responses noted as being biased, all survey results found hereafter can be assumed to be representative of the entire leaver population.

SURVEY RESPONSES (Tables 10 - 32)

Several of the Leaver survey items are identical or very similar to those on the Graduate survey. Where appropriate, Leaver responses are compared to those of the 1991/92 Graduate survey, as published in the 1991/92 Graduate Survey Report.

Enrollment Objectives (Table 10)

As noted in the previous section, students who, at the time they applied, indicated their primary goal was either transferring to a four-year college or personal interests, are significantly more likely to leave. Nevertheless, when asked the same question after leaving, the largest segment of leavers indicate **first job preparation** as their primary objective (31%, p. 24). Over one-fourth (26%) indicate **transferring** as their objective, but this is probably over-estimated due to response bias.

The proportion of leavers whose objective was **retraining** has declined steadily from 18% in 1988 to 14%. In contrast, the segment enrolling for **personal interest** reasons has increased from 7% in 1987 to 11%. The proportion **upgrading current job skills** (18%) has been fairly consistent from year to year.

Reasons For Not Returning (Table 11)

Since 1989, **transferring** has consistently been the primary reason students leave (19%, p. 24). Including those who indicated transfer as a second or third reason, over one-fourth (26%) of the leavers departed because they chose to attend another college. However, these proportions are probably over-estimated due to response bias.

On closer examination, the loss of many of these students may be inevitable. They tend to be primarily local, non-technical students, who chose the College for its convenience, intending to transfer without receiving a degree here. They generally indicate high levels of satisfaction, and are more likely than others to recommend the College to others, but unlikely to express interest in re-enrolling themselves. Of those who gave additional reasons for leaving, nearly half cited the unavailability of their desired program, and half indicated tuition and costs.

Next to transferring, financial factors have been the most consistent reasons why students leave. While less than 6% cited **tuition and costs** as a primary factor, down from 11%, overall nearly one-fourth (24%) gave tuition and costs as a reason, second

only to transfer. One-tenth indicated other **personal financial problems** as a primary reason, and nearly 20% overall. Not surprisingly, financial factors were particularly associated with students who were financially disadvantaged. Thus, due to response bias, the proportion indicating financial factors were probably under-estimated.

While the total proportion citing **personal/family reasons** has been consistently high (22%), the number indicating this as their primary reason has nearly doubled since 1989, from 7% to 14%, second only to transfer. These leavers tend more to be non-traditional aged, part-time, local, female students.

The proportion of students leaving due to **satisfactory employment** continues to decline, from 13% overall to 11%, with 6% making it their primary reason. These leavers tend more to be full-time male students, with low GPAs, enrolled in technical programs. Due to response bias related to GPA, this proportion was probably under-estimated.

The proportion indicating they had **finished their needed courses** nearly dropped in half, both as a primary reason (11% - 5%) and overall (20% - 12%).

As in past years, responses to this item varied significantly across different segments of the population. The following detailed analyses focus on those population segments that have been noted as high-risk with regard to retention.

Residence - Lycoming County students were more likely to leave due to personal, family or health reasons. Others in the immediate area were more likely to transfer.

Financial Disadvantaged Status - Lower income students were more likely to leave due to personal, family, health or financial reasons. Thus, due to response bias related to financial disadvantages, these reasons were probably under-estimated.

Educational Goal - Not surprisingly, students who enrolled for transfer or personal reasons were more likely to transfer.

Application Reason - Students who enrolled at the College because of its convenience were more likely to transfer or leave because their desired program or class was unavailable.

Division - Students enrolled in non-technical programs were likewise more likely to transfer or leave because their preferred program was unavailable. Those in the more technical fields left more often as a result of finding satisfactory work, because of poor housing, or poor grades.

Accumulated Credits - Leavers who departed with 20 or fewer credits were more likely to do so for personal or family reasons, time conflicts, or dissatisfaction with various aspects of the College (instruction, course content, advisor/counselor, program/department). Those who left with over 50 credits generally transferred.

Spring Credit Load - Part-time students were more likely to leave due to personal or family reasons, or time conflicts.

Grade Point Average - Leavers with under a 2.5 semester or cumulative GPA were more likely to leave due to their grade problems, personal financial problems, dissatisfaction with various aspects of the College, or satisfactory work. Thus, due to response bias related to GPA, these reasons were probably under-estimated.

College Satisfaction Ratings (Tables 12 - 15)

The leavers continue to rate their overall educational experience and social experience at the College well above average (*), although both ratings declined slightly from 1990 (p. 25). After four straight years of improvement, **educational satisfaction** dropped from a high of 3.21 to 3.14. In addition, educational satisfaction is significantly correlated with GPA and therefore probably over-estimated.

Social satisfaction did not show as sizable a drop as educational satisfaction, but did decline for the third straight time, from 3.03 in 1988 to 2.99.

In keeping with overall educational satisfaction, combined instructional ratings were also well above average, but down from a high of 3.33 in 1990 to 3.26 (p. 26). This contrasts with 1992 graduate ratings, which increased to 3.32.

Instructional quality was the only instructional variable to improve over 1990, from 3.35 to a high of 3.37. The largest declines occurred in **class size** (3.36 to 3.25) and **course content** (3.36 to 3.26). Compared to the 1992 graduates, two instructional variables were rated significantly poorer by the leavers: **class size** (3.25 - 3.38) and **instructor interest** (3.36 - 3.47). **Instructional quality**, **grading/testing**, **instructor interest** and **course content** were all significantly correlated with GPA and therefore probably over-estimated.

Overall leaver satisfaction with College services has been consistently high and at roughly the same level as that of the graduates. The overall average dropped slightly this year, from 3.00 to 2.99 (p. 27), compared to 2.98 for the 1992 graduates.

The four highest rated services in 1990 showed the most sizable declines in 1992. The **tutoring center** (down from 3.36 to 3.30) and **computer labs** (3.37 to 3.29), consistently among the highest rated services, were the top two rated services despite their decreased ratings. **Library services** (down from 3.31 to a low of 3.19) and **computerized class scheduling** (3.21 to 3.10) had the most significant declines.

Placement/career services has seen the most consistent decline, down slowly from 3.07 in 1987 to 2.92. In contrast, **welcome day/orientation** (up from 3.19 to 3.22) and **billing/payment procedures** (up from 3.08 to 3.11) both increased slightly to ten-year highs.

(*) All survey items involving student ratings are based on a scale from 1 (very disappointed or very poor) to 4 (very satisfied or very good).

The only significant increase occurred in the lowest rated service, **parking**, up from 2.03 to 2.23. Two of the other consistently lowest rated services, **bookstore services/prices** (2.64) and **cafeteria services/prices** (2.81), were rated significantly lower by financially disadvantaged leavers, and thus were probably over-estimated due to response bias. **Financial aid services** (3.01) were rated higher by financially disadvantaged leavers, and thus were probably under-estimated.

General Information (Tables 16 - 19)

The proportion of leavers who were employed over 20 hours a week while attending the College dropped sharply from 41% in 1990 to 29% (p. 28). As noted previously, students working over 10 hours a week are less likely to return. Thus, one possible explanation for the rebound in retention rates the past two years may be this decrease in employment while in college. In addition, employment level is directly correlated with GPA and therefore probably over-estimated due to response bias.

The proportion of leavers finding full-time employment has almost completely reversed from that of five years ago. Only 38% are employed full-time (p. 29), compared to 62% in 1987, and nearly matching a ten-year low. Barely half of all leavers are employed at all (52%), compared to nearly three-fourths (74%) in 1987. Despite this decreased employment, unemployment rates also dropped, from 9.3% in 1990 to 7.5%, lower than that of the 1992 graduates (8.0%). The reason for the decline in both leaver employment and unemployment is the dramatic increase in leaver transfers, which hit a ten-year high of 35%, more than double that of five years ago (16%). Both transfers and full-time employment are probably over-estimated due to response bias, while part-time employment and unemployment are probably under-estimated.

The proportion of leavers indicating their courses were of direct benefit to their career plans has declined steadily from 41% in 1986 to 26% (p. 28). The proportion deriving no benefit has more than doubled since 1988, from 6% to 15%.

The proportion of leavers interested in re-enrolling at the College declined for the second straight year, from 59% in 1989 and 49% in 1990 to 46%, an eight-year low (p. 28). The segments of the leaver population most likely to consider returning are those who left due to time conflicts, personal, family or health reasons, or tuition and costs. Those least likely to show interest in returning are the transfers, those who left due to travel distance, or grade problems. Thus, the reason for the overall decreased interest in re-enrolling is probably due to the increase in transfers.

Employment-Related Items (Tables 20 - 25)

For the first time in six years, the largest segment of employed leavers are working in jobs unrelated to their program of study (44%, p. 29). In contrast, the proportion in directly related jobs has dropped from nearly half in 1989 (49%) to 36%. In comparison, 20% of the 1992 graduates were in unrelated jobs, and 64% in directly related jobs. Furthermore, the proportion of leavers in related jobs is probably over-estimated due to response bias.

Corresponding with the continuing decline in related employment rates is the continuing increase in the proportion of leavers indicating their courses had little or no effect on their job (up from 33% in 1989 to 48%, p. 30). All types of positive impact continue to decline: helped obtain job, down from 35% in 1989 to 23%; helped job performance, down from 49% in 1986 to 26%; helped job advancement, down from 23% in 1987 to 6%.

Likewise, the proportion of leavers who rate their training of little or no use in performing their job has steadily increased from only 17% five years ago to nearly half (47%), a ten-year high (p. 30). In addition, this proportion is probably under-estimated due to response bias. All of this naturally leads to a continuing decline in the proportion of leavers who would recommend their courses to others in similar positions, down from 62% in 1987 to less than half (47%), a nine-year low (p.30). This too is probably over-estimated due to response bias.

Salaries present one relative bright spot for the employed leavers, and may help explain why so many would leave the College for unrelated jobs. The average salary for full-time employed leavers, <u>including</u> those in unrelated jobs, is higher than that for the 1992 full-time employed graduates, <u>excluding</u> those in unrelated jobs ($18,780 - $17,220, p. 33). The proportion of leavers earning over $20,000 is nearly 50% greater than that of the graduates (41% - 28%). This may be explained in part by the greater proportion of leavers who were already employed full-time while at the College. Also, leaver salaries are directly correlated with GPAs, and thus were probably over-estimated due to response bias.

<u>Transfer-Related Items (Tables 26 - 32)</u>

Curiously, the proportion of leaver transfers indicating they had <u>not</u> planned on transferring prior to graduating more than doubled, from 17% to 38%, an eight-year high (p. 34). These "unplanned transfers" were significantly more likely to leave due to dissatisfaction with various aspects of the College (course content, instruction, advisor/counselor, program/department).

The proportion of leavers transferring to in-state, public, four-year institutions declined from 67% to 58% (p. 35). The proportion transferring to in-state two-year institutions increased from 3% to 13%. This increase in two-year transfers is probably directly related to the increase in unplanned transfers (it's unlikely many students plan to transfer from one two-year college to another).

Lock Haven remains the most common choice of leavers, but has declined three straight years, to a six-year low of 17%. The proportions transferring to Penn State and Mansfield both increased to six-year highs of 13%, while Lycoming remained at 11%. Transfers to Bloomsburg dropped from 10% to 4%, a six-year low. These proportions are comparable to those of the 1992 graduates, with three exceptions: only 3% of the graduates transferred to two-year institutions, nearly twice as many graduates (23%) transferred to Penn State, and 19% of the graduate "transfers" re-enrolled at Penn College.

The full-time/part-time status and class standing of leaver transfers remained relatively stable. Most (93%) transfers enrolled full-time, and nearly half (49%) transferred as sophomores (p. 34).

Leaver transfer problems also remained fairly stable, with 69% having no problems (p. 37). This is in contrast to the dramatic decrease in graduate transfers having no problems (from 72% with no problems, to only 53%).

The proportion of leavers having all their credits accepted is barely half that of five years ago (47% - 25%, p. 37). However, much of the corresponding increase has been in the proportion losing only one to six credits (1987-33%, 1992-46%). In all, 71% lost six or fewer credits, compared to only 44% of the 1992 graduate transfers. The great majority (87%) of leavers indicated the College prepared them very well or well to transfer, though the proportion indicating poor or very poor preparation has gradually increased from 0% in 1987 to 13% (p. 37).

C. PROCEDURES AND DATA PREPARATION

A survey (see appendix), consisting of 46 closed items and six open-ended items, was used to determine non-returning students' opinions regrading their experience at Pennsylvania College of Technology.

This year marks the first time the Leaver survey population has included students who officially withdrew from the College. These students are asked to provide their reason for leaving the College at the time they withdraw. In addition, they are now sent the Leaver survey instrument. Even if they do not complete the survey, combining their reasons for leaving, captured through the withdrawal process, with the reasons of other leavers, captured through the survey, provides a much more accurate and complete picture of why our students choose to leave. The withdrawn students who do not complete the Leaver survey are not counted as survey respondents in Tables 1 through 9, but their reasons for leaving are included in Table 11. Therefore the number of responses presented in Table 11 is somewhat greater than the actual number of survey respondents.

The survey was initially mailed to the original study group of 767 non-returners the week of October 6, 1992. A total of 373 usable surveys were processed for a 48.6% response rate. The following chart details each stage of the survey as well as the response rate for each. Samples of the survey letters are presented in the appendix.

Mailing/ Date	Number Surveyed	Cumulative Number Respondents	Cumulative Response Rate
First letter/ October 6, 1992	767	154	20.1%
Second Letter/ November 3, 1992		289	37.7%
Third Letter/ November 20, 1992		348	45.4%
Telephoning/ January 18, 1993		373	48.6%

The responses for all 373 usable surveys were edited, coded and entered into an IBM AS/400 mainframe file. That file was then queried and merged with demographic information and enrollment data for all 3420 expected returning students and down-loaded to a disk file for analysis with a microcomputer statistical software package. Data tables were entered into spreadsheet files and laser-printed; duplicating was done in-house.

TABLE 1A

SPRING TO FALL RETENTION/ATTRITION SUMMARY

SPRING - FALL 1992

DIVISION/ Program	SPRING ENROLL-MENT	SPRING GRADS	SUMMER GRADS	MAXIMUM RETURNING FALL ENROLLMENT	TERMI-NATED	WITH-DRAWN	NON-RETURNERS	TOTAL LEAVERS	RETURNING FALL ENROLL-MENT	RETENTION RATE
BUSINESS & COMPUTER TECHNOLOGIES										
Accounting	157	21	0	136	3	11	18	29	104	76.5%
Business Management	230	38	0	192	7	15	32	47	138	71.9%
Computer Information Systems	128	20	2	106	9	7	23	30	67	63.2%
Computer Operations Technology	29	8	0	21	1	5	5	10	10	47.6%
Legal Assistant	79	16	1	62	1	3	13	16	45	72.6%
Office Administration	57	14	1	42	4	5	6	11	27	64.3%
Office Assistant	14	7	0	7	0	2	2	4	3	42.9%
Retail Management	37	5	0	32	2	6	6	12	18	56.3%
Word Processing	44	11	2	31	2	2	9	11	18	58.1%
DIVISION TOTAL	775	140	6	629	29	56	114	170	430	68.4%
CONSTRUCTION & DESIGN TECHNOLOGIES										
Architectural Technology	122	23	0	99	9	5	7	12	78	78.8%
Building Construction Technology	75	12	0	63	1	4	12	16	46	73.0%
Construction Carpentry	110	42	0	68	4	2	5	7	57	83.8%
Electrical Occupations	76	22	3	51	2	0	4	4	45	88.2%
Electrical Technology	90	19	1	70	4	2	12	14	52	74.3%
Engineering Drafting Technology	47	7	0	40	1	2	3	5	34	85.0%
HVAC Technology	119	27	0	92	3	6	13	19	70	76.1%
Industrial Drafting	13	2	0	11	1	1	4	5	5	45.5%
Industrial Drafting Technology	35	7	0	28	1	3	2	5	22	78.6%
Plumbing	6	3	0	3	0	0	1	1	2	66.7%
Tool Design Technology	7	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	100.0%
DIVISION TOTAL	700	168	6	526	26	25	53	88	412	78.3%

TABLE 1A (cont.)
SPRING TO FALL RETENTION/ATTRITION SUMMARY
SPRING - FALL 1992

DIVISION/ Program	SPRING ENROLL-MENT	SPRING GRADS	SUMMER GRADS	MAXIMUM RETURNING FALL ENROLLMENT	TERMI-NATED	WITH-DRAWN	NON-RETURNERS	TOTAL LEAVERS	RETURNING FALL ENROLL-MENT	RETENTION RATE
HEALTH SCIENCES										
Culinary Arts	52	5	0	47	4	3	7	10	33	70.2%
Dental Hygiene	86	26	0	60	1	4	1	5	54	90.0%
Food & Hospitality Management	52	7	0	45	1	3	6	9	35	77.8%
Nursing	303	53	0	250	6	11	31	42	202	80.8%
Occupational Therapy Assistant	122	1	14	107	8	4	11	15	84	78.5%
Practical Nursing	66	24	0	42	1	2	4	6	35	83.3%
Radiography	60	0	13	47	2	4	2	6	39	83.0%
Surgical Technology	36	0	15	21	3	4	1	5	13	61.9%
DIVISION TOTAL	777	116	42	619	26	35	63	98	495	80.0%
INDUSTRIAL AND ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGIES										
Automated Manufacturing Technology	23	3	0	20	0	0	3	3	17	85.0%
Civil Engineering Technology	57	9	0	48	1	1	4	5	42	87.5%
Electronics Technology	152	31	2	119	4	11	9	20	95	79.8%
Machinist General	56	20	0	36	3	1	10	11	22	61.1%
Plastics & Polymer Technology	24	3	0	21	2	0	2	2	17	81.0%
Toolmaking Technology	62	12	2	48	2	1	7	8	38	79.2%
Welding	32	14	0	18	2	0	5	5	11	61.1%
Welding Technology	17	0	1	16	0	0	1	1	15	93.8%
DIVISION TOTAL	423	92	5	326	14	14	41	55	257	78.8%
INTEGRATED STUDIES										
Advertising Art	81	17	2	62	6	4	11	15	41	66.1%
Early Childhood Education	85	12	0	73	4	3	11	14	55	75.3%
General Studies	345	15	2	328	38	28	105	133	157	47.9%
Graphic Communication	59	12	0	47	2	4	5	9	36	76.6%
Human Services	102	8	2	92	12	7	11	18	62	67.4%
Individual Studies	57	12	0	45	1	6	17	23	21	46.7%
Mass Communication	59	4	1	54	6	4	5	9	39	72.2%
Technology Studies	13	2	0	11	0	2	3	5	6	54.5%
DIVISION TOTAL	801	82	7	712	69	58	168	226	417	58.6%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 1A (cont.)
SPRING TO FALL RETENTION/ATTRITION SUMMARY
SPRING - FALL 1992

DIVISION/ Program	SPRING ENROLL-MENT	SPRING GRADS	SUMMER GRADS	MAXIMUM RETURNING FALL ENROLLMENT	TERMI-NATED	WITH-DRAWN	NON-RETURNERS	TOTAL LEAVERS	RETURNING FALL ENROLL-MENT	RETENTION RATE
NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT/TRANSPORTATION TECHNOLOGIES										
Auto Body Technician	5	2	0	3	0	1	2	3	0	0.0%
Auto Body Technology	36	7	0	29	0	2	6	8	21	72.4%
Automotive Engineering	8	1	0	7	0	0	1	1	6	85.7%
Automotive Service Management	14	3	0	11	0	1	0	1	10	90.9%
Automotive Service Technician	28	11	0	17	1	0	5	5	11	64.7%
Automotive Technology	58	16	1	41	5	0	3	3	33	80.5%
Aviation Maintenance Technician	42	14	1	27	0	0	6	6	21	77.8%
Aviation Technology	26	9	1	16	1	0	3	3	12	75.0%
Avionics Technology	28	12	1	15	0	0	3	3	12	80.0%
Diesel Technician	47	14	0	33	5	1	4	5	23	69.7%
Diesel Technology	14	5	0	9	0	0	0	0	9	100.0%
Forest Technology	76	13	0	63	7	2	11	13	43	68.3%
Interior Plantscape/Floral Design	22	5	0	17	0	1	2	3	14	82.4%
Landscape/Nursery Technology	65	21	0	44	2	2	4	6	36	81.8%
Outdoor Power Equipment	8	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	100.0%
Service & Operation of Heavy Equipment	60	11	0	49	3	5	6	11	35	71.4%
DIVISION TOTAL	537	151	4	382	24	15	56	71	287	75.1%
NORTH CAMPUS										
Accounting	34	4	0	30	0	3	6	9	21	70.0%
Business Management	45	7	0	38	4	1	13	14	20	52.6%
Computer Information Systems	20	4	0	16	2	0	2	2	12	75.0%
Early Childhood Education	10	3	0	7	0	0	3	3	4	57.1%
General Studies	11	0	0	11	0	0	6	6	5	45.5%
Human Services	43	8	0	35	2	3	3	6	27	77.1%
Individual Studies	4	0	0	4	0	0	1	1	3	75.0%
Legal Assistant	22	0	0	22	1	2	3	5	16	72.7%
Nursing	10	0	0	10	0	0	2	2	8	80.0%
Office Administration	22	4	0	18	2	3	3	6	10	55.6%
Office Assistant	6	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	5	83.3%
Practical Nursing	29	0	0	29	1	2	3	5	23	79.3%
DIVISION TOTAL	256	30	0	226	13	14	45	59	154	68.1%
COLLEGE TOTAL	**4269**	**779**	**70**	3420	**201**	**217**	**550**	767	2452	71.7%

Filename: Lwrs01A.wq1
Date: 06/28/93

GENERAL INFORMATION AND DEMOGRAPHICS
TABLES 1B - 9

TABLE 1B
LEAVER STUDENTS BY CURRICULUM
SPRING - FALL 1992

DIVISION/ Program	Total Population (N)	%	Responses (N)	Response Rate %
BUSINESS & COMPUTER TECHNOLOGIES				
Accounting	29	3.8%	10	34.5%
Business Management	47	6.1%	22	46.8%
Computer Information Systems	30	3.9%	13	43.3%
Computer Operations Technology	10	1.3%	4	40.0%
Legal Assistant	16	2.1%	6	37.5%
Office Administration	11	1.4%	7	63.6%
Office Assistant	4	0.5%	3	75.0%
Retail Management	12	1.6%	5	41.7%
Word Processing	11	1.4%	6	54.5%
DIVISION TOTAL	170	22.2%	76	44.7%
CONSTRUCTION & DESIGN TECHNOLOGIES				
Architectural Technology	12	1.6%	4	33.3%
Building Construction Technology	16	2.1%	10	62.5%
Construction Carpentry	7	0.9%	5	71.4%
Electrical Occupations	4	0.5%	1	25.0%
Electrical Technology	14	1.8%	6	42.9%
Engineering Drafting Technology	5	0.7%	2	40.0%
HVAC Technology	19	2.5%	9	47.4%
Industrial Drafting	5	0.7%	3	60.0%
Industrial Drafting Technology	5	0.7%	1	20.0%
Plumbing	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
DIVISION TOTAL	88	11.5%	41	46.6%

TABLE 1B (cont.)
LEAVER STUDENTS BY CURRICULUM
SPRING - FALL 1992

DIVISION/ Program	Total Population (N)	%	Responses (N)	Response Rate %
HEALTH SCIENCES				
Culinary Arts	10	1.3%	4	40.0%
Dental Hygiene	5	0.7%	2	40.0%
Food & Hospitality Management	9	1.2%	4	44.4%
Nursing	42	5.5%	21	50.0%
Occupational Therapy Assistant	15	2.0%	6	40.0%
Practical Nursing	6	0.8%	1	16.7%
Radiography	6	0.8%	3	50.0%
Surgical Technology	5	0.7%	2	40.0%
DIVISION TOTAL	98	12.8%	43	43.9%
INDUSTRIAL & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGIES				
Automated Manufacturing Technology	3	0.4%	3	100.0%
Civil Engineering Technology	5	0.7%	2	40.0%
Electronics Technology	20	2.6%	11	55.0%
Machinist General	11	1.4%	7	63.6%
Plastics & Polymer Technology	2	0.3%	1	50.0%
Toolmaking Technology	8	1.0%	3	37.5%
Welding	5	0.7%	3	60.0%
Welding Technology	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
DIVISION TOTAL	55	7.2%	30	54.5%
INTEGRATED STUDIES				
Advertising Art	15	2.0%	10	66.7%
Early Childhood Education	14	1.8%	9	64.3%
General Studies	133	17.3%	67	50.4%
Graphic Communication	9	1.2%	3	33.3%
Human Services	18	2.3%	9	50.0%
Individual Studies	23	3.0%	11	47.8%
Mass Communication	9	1.2%	8	88.9%
Technology Studies	5	0.7%	3	60.0%
DIVISION TOTAL	226	29.5%	120	53.1%

TABLE 1B (cont.)
LEAVER STUDENTS BY CURRICULUM
SPRING - FALL 1992

DIVISION/ Program	Total Population (N)	%	Responses (N)	Response Rate %
NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT/ TRANSPORTATION TECHNOLOGIES				
Auto Body Technician	3	0.4%	1	33.3%
Auto Body Technology	8	1.0%	4	50.0%
Automotive Engineering	1	0.1%	1	100.0%
Automotive Service Management	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Automotive Service Technician	5	0.7%	3	60.0%
Automotive Technology	3	0.4%	0	0.0%
Aviation Maintenance Technician	6	0.8%	0	0.0%
Aviation Technology	3	0.4%	2	66.7%
Avionics Technology	3	0.4%	1	33.3%
Diesel Technician	5	0.7%	1	20.0%
Forest Technology	13	1.7%	6	46.2%
Interior Plantscape/Floral Design	3	0.4%	2	66.7%
Landscape/Nursery Technology	6	0.8%	2	33.3%
Service & Operation of Heavy Equipment	11	1.4%	4	36.4%
DIVISION TOTAL	71	9.3%	27	38.0%
NORTH CAMPUS				
Accounting	9	1.2%	5	55.6%
Business Management	14	1.8%	10	71.4%
Computer Information Systems	2	0.3%	1	50.0%
Early Childhood Education	3	0.4%	2	66.7%
General Studies	6	0.8%	3	50.0%
Human Services	6	0.8%	5	83.3%
Individual Studies	1	0.1%	1	100.0%
Legal Assistant	5	0.7%	3	60.0%
Nursing	2	0.3%	1	50.0%
Office Administration	6	0.8%	3	50.0%
Practical Nursing	5	0.7%	2	40.0%
DIVISION TOTAL	59	7.7%	36	61.0%
COLLEGE TOTAL	**767**	**100.0%**	**373**	**48.6%**

Filename: Lvrs01B.wq1
Date: 06/29/93

TABLE 2
LEAVER STUDENTS BY COUNTY OF RESIDENCE
SPRING - FALL 1992

AREA/ County	Total Population (N)	%	Responses (N)	Response Rate %
IMMEDIATE AREA				
Lycoming	335	43.7%	155	46.3%
Bradford	27	3.5%	16	59.3%
Clinton	34	4.4%	19	55.9%
Montour	9	1.2%	6	66.7%
Northumberland	49	6.4%	19	38.8%
Potter	4	0.5%	1	25.0%
Snyder	16	2.1%	8	50.0%
Sullivan	7	0.9%	4	57.1%
Tioga	68	8.9%	41	60.3%
Union	31	4.0%	12	38.7%
IMMEDIATE TOTAL	580	75.6%	281	48.4%
OUTSIDE IMMEDIATE AREA				
Adams	2	0.3%	0	0.0%
Allegheny	0	0.0%		NA
Armstrong	1	0.1%	1	100.0%
Beaver	0	0.0%		NA
Bedford	3	0.4%	1	33.3%
Berks	3	0.4%	1	33.3%
Blair	10	1.3%	4	40.0%
Bucks	4	0.5%	3	75.0%
Butler	2	0.3%	1	50.0%
Cambria	8	1.0%	3	37.5%
Cameron	0	0.0%		NA
Carbon	0	0.0%		NA
Centre	24	3.1%	13	54.2%
Chester	9	1.2%	3	33.3%
Clarion	1	0.1%	1	100.0%
Clearfield	16	2.1%	10	62.5%
Columbia	14	1.8%	7	50.0%
Crawford	0	0.0%		NA
Cumberland	3	0.4%	0	0.0%
Dauphin	4	0.5%	4	100.0%
Delaware	0	0.0%		NA
Elk	7	0.9%	3	42.9%
Erie	2	0.3%	0	0.0%
Fayette	0	0.0%		NA
Forest	0	0.0%		NA
Franklin	2	0.3%	1	50.0%
Fulton	0	0.0%		NA
Greene	0	0.0%		NA
Huntingdon	4	0.5%	2	50.0%
Indiana	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Jefferson	1	0.1%	1	100.0%
Juniata	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Lackawanna	3	0.4%	2	66.7%
Lancaster	2	0.3%	1	50.0%
Lawrence	0	0.0%		NA
Lebanon	2	0.3%	1	50.0%
Lehigh	3	0.4%	1	33.3%
Luzerne	4	0.5%	1	25.0%

TABLE 2 (cont.)
LEAVER STUDENTS BY COUNTY OF RESIDENCE
SPRING - FALL 1992

AREA/ County	Total Population (N)	%	Responses (N)	Response Rate %
OUTSIDE IMMEDIATE AREA (cont.)				
McKean	2	0.3%	1	50.0%
Mercer	0	0.0%		NA
Mifflin	7	0.9%	3	42.9%
Monroe	2	0.3%	2	100.0%
Montgomery	5	0.7%	2	40.0%
Northampton	3	0.4%	2	66.7%
Perry	0	0.0%		NA
Philadelphia	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Pike	0	0.0%		NA
Schuylkill	13	1.7%	9	69.2%
Somerset	4	0.5%	3	75.0%
Susquehanna	0	0.0%		NA
Venango	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Warren	3	0.4%	1	33.3%
Washington	0	0.0%		NA
Wayne	1	0.1%	1	100.0%
Westmoreland	1	0.1%	1	100.0%
Wyoming	0	0.0%		NA
York	2	0.3%	1	50.0%
TOTAL OUTSIDE IMMEDIATE AREA	181	23.6%	91	50.3%
OUT-OF-STATE/FOREIGN	6	0.8%	1	16.7%
COLLEGE TOTAL	**767**	**100.0%**	**373**	**48.6%**

TABLE 3
LEAVER STUDENTS BY GENDER
SPRING - FALL 1992

GENDER	Total Population (N)	%	Responses (N)	Response Rate %
Female	363	47.3%	189	52.1%
Male	404	52.7%	184	45.5%
COLLEGE TOTAL	**767**	**100.0%**	**373**	**48.6%**

Filename: Lvrs0203.wq1
Date: 6/24/93

TABLE 4
LEAVER STUDENTS BY AGE
SPRING - FALL 1992

AGE	Total Population (N)	%	Responses (N)	Response Rate %
17 - 19	113	14.7%	62	54.9%
20 - 24	385	50.2%	178	46.2%
25 - 29	93	12.1%	36	38.7%
30 - 39	107	14.0%	56	52.3%
Over 40	67	8.7%	40	59.7%
Not Given	2	0.3%	1	50.0%
COLLEGE TOTAL	**767**	**100.0%**	**373**	**48.6%**
Mean Age	**25.4**		**25.7**	

TABLE 5
LEAVER STUDENTS BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND
SPRING - FALL 1992

RACE	Total Population (N)	%	Responses (N)	Response Rate %
American Indian	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Asian	6	0.8%	0	0.0%
Black	18	2.3%	2	11.1%
Hispanic	3	0.4%	1	33.3%
White	739	96.3%	370	50.1%
COLLEGE TOTAL	**767**	**100.0%**	**373**	**48.6%**

Filename: Lvrs0405.wq1
Date: 6/29/93

TABLE 6
LEAVER STUDENTS BY ACCUMULATED CREDITS
SPRING - FALL 1992

ACCUMULATED CREDITS	Total Population (N)	%	Responses (N)	Response Rate %
0	21	2.7%	11	52.4%
1 to 3	21	2.7%	12	57.1%
4 to 11	64	8.3%	26	40.6%
12 to 20	102	13.3%	57	55.9%
21 to 35	249	32.5%	115	46.2%
36 to 50	105	13.7%	53	50.5%
51 to 65	150	19.6%	76	50.7%
Over 65	55	7.2%	23	41.8%
COLLEGE TOTAL	**767**	**100.0%**	**373**	**48.6%**
Mean Accumulated Crs	34.1		33.8	

TABLE 7
LEAVER STUDENTS BY CUMULATIVE GPA
SPRING - FALL 1992

CUMULATIVE GPA	Total Population (N)	%	Responses (N)	Response Rate %
0.00	4	0.5%	3	75.0%
0.01 - 0.99	5	0.7%	2	40.0%
1.00 - 1.99	110	14.7%	47	42.7%
2.00 - 2.49	199	26.7%	75	37.7%
2.50 - 2.99	166	22.3%	87	52.4%
3.00 - 3.49	147	19.7%	82	55.8%
3.50 - 3.99	90	12.1%	50	55.6%
4.00	25	3.4%	19	76.0%
COLLEGE TOTAL	**746**	**100.0%**	**365**	**48.9%**

Mean Cumulative Grade Point Average

Total Spring 1992 Class	2.81
Total Fall 1992 Non-Returners	2.65
Survey Respondents	2.74
Survey Non-Respondents	2.56

Filename: Lvrs0607.wq1
Date: 6/24/93

TABLE 8
LEAVER STUDENTS BY SPRING SEMESTER CREDITS
SPRING - FALL 1992

SEMESTER CREDITS	Total Population (N)	%	Responses (N)	Response Rate %
1-5	109	14.2%	57	52.3%
6-11	115	15.0%	56	48.7%
12-15	368	48.0%	171	46.5%
16 +	175	22.8%	89	50.9%
COLLEGE TOTAL	**767**	**100.0%**	**373**	**48.6%**
Mean Spring Semester Crs.	11.8		11.7	

TABLE 9
LEAVER STUDENTS BY SPRING SEMESTER GPA
SPRING - FALL 1992

SEMESTER GPA	Total Population (N)	%	Responses (N)	Response Rate %
0.00	23	3.3%	10	43.5%
0.01 - 0.99	17	2.4%	8	47.1%
1.00 - 1.99	120	17.2%	49	40.8%
2.00 - 2.49	148	21.2%	67	45.3%
2.50 - 2.99	120	17.2%	65	54.2%
3.00 - 3.49	124	17.8%	61	49.2%
3.50 - 3.99	62	8.9%	30	48.4%
4.00	84	12.0%	55	65.5%
COLLEGE TOTAL	**698**	**100.0%**	**345**	**49.4%**

Mean Semester Grade Point Average	
Total Spring 1992 Class	2.74
Total Fall 1992 Non-Returners	2.55
Survey Respondents	2.66
Survey Non-Respondents	2.44

Filename: Lvrs0809.wq1
Date: 6/29/93

TABLE 10
PRIMARY OBJECTIVE IN ATTENDING
SPRING - FALL 1992

OBJECTIVE	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
Transfer to Four-Year College	118	25.5%	79	29.6%
Preparation for First Job	142	30.7%	69	25.8%
Upgrading Current Job Skills	84	18.1%	51	19.1%
Retraining for New Job	66	14.3%	39	14.6%
Personal Interest	53	11.4%	29	10.9%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TOTAL	463	100.0%	267	100.0%

TABLE 11
REASONS FOR NOT REENROLLING
SPRING - FALL 1992

REASON	Primary Rank	N	%	Secondary N	%	Tertiary N	%	Total N	%	1990 %
Finished Needed Courses	7	26	5.4%	19	4.0%	12	2.5%	57	11.9%	19.6%
Travel Distance	16	9	1.9%	10	2.1%	23	4.8%	42	8.7%	8.3%
Transferred to Another College	1	90	18.7%	24	5.0%	9	1.9%	123	25.6%	27.9%
Satisfactory Employment	4	30	6.2%	11	2.3%	10	2.1%	51	10.6%	13.4%
Work/Class Time Conflicts	11	14	2.9%	13	2.7%	11	2.3%	38	7.9%	16.7%
Financial Problems	3	48	10.0%	31	6.4%	16	3.3%	95	19.8%	19.2%
Poor Housing	28	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	1	0.2%	2	0.4%	5.1%
Relocated (moved)	13	13	2.7%	7	1.5%	3	0.6%	23	4.8%	7.6%
Grade Problems	12	14	2.9%	8	1.7%	3	0.6%	25	5.2%	8.7%
Poor Instruction	15	10	2.1%	3	0.6%	6	1.2%	19	4.0%	5.8%
Course Content	14	10	2.1%	8	1.7%	9	1.9%	27	5.6%	3.6%
Personal/Family Reasons	2	69	14.3%	16	3.3%	20	4.2%	105	21.8%	20.7%
Health Problems	5	29	6.0%	13	2.7%	3	0.6%	45	9.4%	4.7%
Unsatisfactory Advisor/Couselor	21	3	0.6%	6	1.2%	9	1.9%	18	3.7%	3.3%
Program Unavailable	10	16	3.3%	23	4.8%	17	3.5%	56	11.6%	15.6%
Unsure Career Goals	9	18	3.7%	19	4.0%	15	3.1%	52	10.8%	14.1%
Study Time Required	23	2	0.4%	7	1.5%	4	0.8%	13	2.7%	1.8%
Inconvenient Course Times	22	2	0.4%	12	2.5%	12	2.5%	26	5.4%	6.2%
Tuition & Costs	6	27	5.6%	57	11.9%	32	6.7%	116	24.1%	35.5%
Other:										
Dissatisfaction w/Penn College	18	4	0.8%	1	0.2%	1	0.2%	6	1.2%	NA
Dissatisfaction w/Program/Dept.	17	5	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	1.0%	NA
Courses not transferable	25	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	2	0.4%	NA
Class cancelled/unavailable	8	25	5.2%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	26	5.4%	NA
Dissatisfaction w/Williamsport	24	2	0.4%	1	0.2%	1	0.2%	4	0.8%	NA
Transportation problems	25	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	2	0.4%	NA
Financial Aid problems	20	4	0.8%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	5	1.0%	NA
Temporary Leave	18	4	0.8%	1	0.2%	1	0.2%	6	1.2%	2.2%
Military service	27	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	NA
No 4-Yr Degree	29	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	1	0.2%	2.2%
Other		3	0.6%	1	0.2%	1	0.2%	5	1.0%	NA
Not Given		1	0.2%	187	38.9%	259	53.8%	447	NA	NA
TOTAL		481	100.0%	481	100.0%	481	100.0%	481	100.0%	

Filename: Lvrs1011.wq1
Date: 6/29/93

TABLE 12
SATISFACTION WITH EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE
SPRING - FALL 1992

EDUCATIONAL SATISFACTION	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
Very Satisfied	113	31.3%	88	32.7%
Satisfied	199	55.1%	155	57.6%
Disappointed	36	10.0%	20	7.4%
Very Disappointed	13	3.6%	6	2.2%
TOTAL	**361**	**100.0%**	**269**	**100.0%**
Mean Rating	**3.14**		**3.21**	

TABLE 13
SATISFACTION WITH SOCIAL EXPERIENCE
SPRING - FALL 1992

SOCIAL SATISFACTION	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
Very Satisfied	49	14.3%	47	18.1%
Satisfied	249	72.6%	179	68.8%
Disappointed	36	10.5%	24	9.2%
Very Disappointed	9	2.6%	10	3.8%
TOTAL	**343**	**100.0%**	**260**	**100.0%**
Mean Rating	**2.99**		**3.01**	

Filename: LVRS1213.wq1
Date: 06/29/93

TABLE 14
RATING OF INSTRUCTIONAL VARIABLES
SPRING - FALL 1992

INSTRUCTIONAL VARIABLE	Very Good (4) (N)	%	Good (3) (N)	%	Poor (2) (N)	%	Very Poor (1) (N)	%	Mean Rating	Rank	1990 Mean Rating
Instructional Quality	136	47.2%	129	44.8%	16	5.6%	7	2.4%	3.37	1	3.35
Grading/Testing	105	36.3%	158	54.7%	23	8.0%	3	1.0%	3.26	5	3.31
Instructor Interest	145	50.0%	113	39.0%	23	7.9%	9	3.1%	3.36	2	3.42
Course Content	108	37.1%	156	53.6%	23	7.9%	4	1.4%	3.26	4	3.36
Instructional Films/Tapes/etc.	62	23.9%	149	57.5%	39	15.1%	9	3.5%	3.02	7	3.11
Hands-on Equipment	119	46.9%	101	39.8%	23	9.1%	11	4.3%	3.29	3	3.36
Class Size	117	40.8%	135	47.0%	25	8.7%	10	3.5%	3.25	6	3.36
OVERALL RATING	**792**	**40.4%**	**941**	**48.1%**	**172**	**8.8%**	**53**	**2.7%**	**3.26**		**3.33**

Filename: Lvrs14.wq1
Date: 6/29/93

TABLE 15
RATING OF SERVICE VARIABLES
SPRING - FALL 1992

SERVICE VARIABLE	Very Good (4) (N)	%	Good (3) (N)	%	Poor (2) (N)	%	Very Poor (1) (N)	%	Response Rate	Mean Rating	Rank	1990 Mean Rating
Admissions Procedures	96	27.5%	211	60.5%	29	8.3%	13	3.7%	93.6%	3.12	5	3.17
Welcome Day/Orientation	77	29.1%	172	64.9%	13	4.9%	3	1.1%	71.0%	3.22	3	3.19
Academic Advisement	96	29.0%	172	52.0%	49	14.8%	14	4.2%	88.7%	3.06	8	3.08
Computerized Class Scheduling	85	25.7%	204	61.6%	32	9.7%	10	3.0%	88.7%	3.10	7	3.21
Billing/Payment Procedures	78	23.1%	227	67.4%	24	7.1%	8	2.4%	90.3%	3.11	6	3.08
Financial Aid Services	77	26.8%	156	54.4%	34	11.8%	20	7.0%	76.9%	3.01	10	3.04
Tutoring Center	103	39.8%	135	52.1%	16	6.2%	5	1.9%	69.4%	3.30	1	3.36
Library Services	101	31.6%	182	56.9%	33	10.3%	4	1.3%	85.8%	3.19	4	3.31
Bookstore Services/Prices	43	12.6%	171	50.3%	87	25.6%	39	11.5%	91.2%	2.64	15	2.67
Placement/Career Services	34	17.9%	118	62.1%	27	14.2%	11	5.8%	50.9%	2.92	12	2.95
Counseling	61	24.2%	147	58.3%	31	12.3%	13	5.2%	67.6%	3.02	9	3.05
Cafeteria Services/Prices	49	18.4%	145	54.3%	46	17.2%	27	10.1%	71.6%	2.81	14	2.85
Intramural Athletics	27	17.5%	95	61.7%	23	14.9%	9	5.8%	41.3%	2.91	13	2.84
Student Activities/Clubs	38	19.3%	117	59.4%	33	16.8%	9	4.6%	52.8%	2.93	11	2.85
Parking	25	7.6%	115	35.1%	100	30.5%	88	26.8%	87.9%	2.23	16	2.03
Computer Labs	112	39.2%	152	53.1%	14	4.9%	8	2.8%	76.7%	3.29	2	3.37
College Overall	1102	24.5%	2519	56.1%	591	13.2%	281	6.3%	75.3%	2.99		3.00

Filename: Lvrs15.wq1
Date: 06/28/93

TABLE 16
BENEFIT OF COURSES TO CAREER PLANS
SPRING - FALL 1992

BENEFIT	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
Of Immediate, Direct Benefit	79	25.5%	74	30.3%
Of Long Term, Direct Benefit	116	37.4%	95	38.9%
Of Indirect Benefit	69	22.3%	54	22.1%
Of No Benefit	46	14.8%	21	8.6%
TOTAL	**310**	**100.0%**	**244**	**100.0%**

TABLE 17
INTEREST IN TAKING OTHER COURSES
SPRING - FALL 1992

INTEREST	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
Yes	134	45.7%	113	49.3%
No	159	54.3%	116	50.7%
TOTAL	**293**	**100.0%**	**229**	**100.0%**

TABLE 18
EMPLOYMENT STATUS WHILE IN COLLEGE
SPRING - FALL 1992

STATUS	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
Not Employed At All	134	42.1%	92	36.4%
Employed 1-10 Hours/Week	24	7.5%	16	6.3%
Employed 11-20 Hours/Week	67	21.1%	41	16.2%
Employed 21-35 Hours/Week	39	12.3%	48	19.0%
Employed 36 or More Hours/Week	54	17.0%	56	22.1%
TOTAL	**318**	**100.0%**	**253**	**100.0%**

Filename: LVRS1618.wq1
Date: 06/29/93

TABLE 19
CURRENT STATUS OF LEAVERS
SPRING - FALL 1992

STATUS	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
Employed				
Full-Time	141	37.8%	122	45.2%
Part-Time	52	13.9%	36	13.3%
Total Employed	193	51.7%	158	58.5%
Total Unemployed	28	7.5%	25	9.3%
Military	4	1.1%	2	0.7%
Attending College	131	35.1%	79	29.3%
Unavailable For Employment	16	4.3%	6	2.2%
Not Given	1	0.3%	0	0.0%
TOTAL	**373**	**100.0%**	**270**	**100.0%**

TABLE 20
RELATIONSHIP OF EMPLOYMENT TO COURSE WORK
SPRING - FALL 1992

JOB-PROGRAM RELATION	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
Directly Related	65	36.1%	56	36.1%
Indirectly Related	35	19.4%	45	29.0%
Unrelated	80	44.4%	54	34.8%
TOTAL	**180**	**100.0%**	**155**	**100.0%**

Filename: Lvrs1920.wq1
Date: 06/28/93

TABLE 21
COURSE IMPACT ON OCCUPATION
SPRING - FALL 1992

IMPACT	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	178		149	
Helped to Obtain Job	40	22.5%	45	30.2%
Helped Job Performance	47	26.4%	50	33.6%
Helped Job Advancement	10	5.6%	19	12.8%
Little/No Effect on Job	85	47.8%	67	45.0%
Other Effect on Job	7	3.9%	1	0.7%

TABLE 22
USEFULNESS OF COURSES IN JOB PERFORMANCE
SPRING - FALL 1992

USEFULNESS	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
Very Useful	39	22.3%	33	21.9%
Useful	54	30.9%	60	39.7%
Of Little Use	40	22.9%	28	18.5%
Of No Use	42	24.0%	30	19.9%
TOTAL	**175**	**100.0%**	**151**	**100.0%**

TABLE 23
RECOMMEND COURSES TO OTHERS IN FIELD
SPRING - FALL 1992

RECOMMEND COURSES	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
Yes	81	46.8%	74	50.3%
Undecided	57	32.9%	47	32.0%
No	35	20.2%	26	17.7%
TOTAL	**173**	**100.0%**	**147**	**100.0%**

Filename: LVRS2123.wq1
Date: 06/29/93

TABLE 24
LOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT BY COUNTY
SPRING - FALL 1992

AREA/ County	Spring - Fall 1992 Number Employed	Percent	Spring - Fall 1990 Number Employed	Percent
IMMEDIATE				
Lycoming	65	43.6%	54	43.5%
Bradford	7	4.7%	1	0.8%
Clinton	3	2.0%	6	4.8%
Montour	1	0.7%	1	0.8%
Northumberland	8	5.4%	6	4.8%
Potter		0.0%	3	2.4%
Snyder	3	2.0%		0.0%
Sullivan		0.0%		0.0%
Tioga	12	8.1%	7	5.6%
Union	3	2.0%	4	3.2%
IMMEDIATE TOTAL	**102**	**68.5%**	**82**	**66.1%**
OUTSIDE IMMEDIATE AREA				
Adams		0.0%		0.0%
Allegheny		0.0%	1	0.8%
Armstrong	1	0.7%	1	0.8%
Beaver		0.0%		0.0%
Bedford		0.0%		0.0%
Berks	1	0.7%	2	1.6%
Blair	2	1.3%	4	3.2%
Bucks	1	0.7%	1	0.8%
Butler		0.0%		0.0%
Cambria	1	0.7%	1	0.8%
Cameron	1	0.7%		0.0%
Carbon		0.0%	1	0.8%
Centre	4	2.7%	5	4.0%
Chester	2	1.3%	1	0.8%
Clarion		0.0%		0.0%
Clearfield	2	1.3%	1	0.8%
Columbia	3	2.0%	4	3.2%
Crawford		0.0%		0.0%
Cumberland		0.0%	4	3.2%
Dauphin	3	2.0%		0.0%
Delaware		0.0%		0.0%
Elk	1	0.7%		0.0%
Erie		0.0%	1	0.8%

TABLE 24 (cont.)
LOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT BY COUNTY
SPRING - FALL 1992

SERVICE AREA/ County	Spring - Fall 1992 Number Employed	Percent	Spring - Fall 1990 Number Employed	Percent
OUTSIDE IMMEDIATE AREA (Continued)				
Fayette		0.0%		0.0%
Forest		0.0%		0.0%
Franklin	1	0.7%		0.0%
Fulton		0.0%	1	0.8%
Greene		0.0%		0.0%
Huntingdon	1	0.7%		0.0%
Indiana		0.0%	1	0.8%
Jefferson	2	1.3%	1	0.8%
Juniata		0.0%		0.0%
Lackawanna	1	0.7%	1	0.8%
Lancaster	1	0.7%	1	0.8%
Lawrence		0.0%		0.0%
Lebanon	1	0.7%	2	1.6%
Lehigh	1	0.7%		0.0%
Luzerne		0.0%	1	0.8%
McKean	1	0.7%		0.0%
Mercer		0.0%		0.0%
Mifflin	1	0.7%	1	0.8%
Monroe	2	1.3%		0.0%
Montgomery	1	0.7%	1	0.8%
Northampton		0.0%	1	0.8%
Perry		0.0%		0.0%
Philadelphia	1	0.7%		0.0%
Pike		0.0%		0.0%
Schuylkill	2	1.3%	3	2.4%
Somerset	1	0.7%		0.0%
Susquehanna		0.0%		0.0%
Venango		0.0%		0.0%
Warren	1	0.7%		0.0%
Washington		0.0%		0.0%
Wayne		0.0%		0.0%
Westmoreland		0.0%		0.0%
Wyoming		0.0%		0.0%
York		0.0%	1	0.8%
TOTAL OUTSIDE IMMEDIATE AREA	**40**	**26.8%**	**42**	**33.9%**
OUT-OF-STATE	**7**	**4.7%**	**0**	**0.0%**
GRAND TOTAL	**149**	**100.0%**	**124**	**100.0%**

Filename: Lvrs24.wq1
Date: 6/29/93

TABLE 25
ANNUAL FULL-TIME SALARIES
SPRING - FALL 1992

SALARY RANGE	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
Less than $ 9,500	3	3.6%	3	4.8%
$9,500 - $11,499	13	15.7%	6	9.5%
$11,500 - $13,499	8	9.6%	8	12.7%
$13,500 - $15,499	10	12.0%	8	12.7%
$15,500 - $17,499	9	10.8%	8	12.7%
$17,500 - $19,499	6	7.2%	7	11.1%
$19,500 - 24,499	17	20.5%	9	14.3%
$24,500 +	17	20.5%	14	22.2%
TOTAL	**83**	**100.0%**	**63**	**100.0%**
Mean Salary	**$18,780**		**$18,140**	
Median Salary	**$17,000**		**$17,500**	

Filename: Lvrs25.wq1
Date: 6/29/93

TABLE 26
PLANNED TO TRANSFER PRIOR TO GRADUATION
SPRING - FALL 1992

PLANNED TRANSFER	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
Yes	55	45.8%	48	68.7%
Unsure	19	15.8%	12	17.1%
No	46	38.3%	12	17.1%
TOTAL	**120**	**100.0%**	**70**	**100.0%**

TABLE 27
TRANSFERS ENROLLMENT STATUS
SPRING - FALL 1992

STATUS	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
Full-time	107	93.0%	62	93.9%
Part-time	8	7.0%	4	6.1%
TOTAL	**115**	**100.0%**	**66**	**100.0%**

TABLE 28
TRANSFERS CLASS STANDING
SPRING - FALL 1992

CLASS STANDING	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
Freshman	26	23.0%	18	26.5%
Sophomore	55	48.7%	32	47.1%
Junior	28	24.8%	14	20.6%
Senior	4	3.5%	3	4.4%
Graduate Student	0	0.0%	1	1.5%
TOTAL	**113**	**100.0%**	**68**	**100.0%**

Filename: Lvrs2628.wq1
Date: 6/29/93

TABLE 29
TRANSFERS BY INSTITUTION
SPRING - FALL 1992

INSTITUTION TYPE/ Institution	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
IN-STATE, PUBLIC, 4-YEAR				
Bloomsburg University	5	4.2%	7	10.0%
California University of PA	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
Clarion University	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
East Stroudsburg University	2	1.7%	3	4.3%
Edinboro University	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
Indiana University of PA	3	2.5%	3	4.3%
Kutztown University	2	1.7%	3	4.3%
Lock Haven University	20	16.7%	13	18.6%
Mansfield University	16	13.3%	3	4.3%
Millersville University	1	0.8%	1	1.4%
Shippensburg University	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
Pennsylvania State University	16	13.3%	9	12.9%
Pittsburgh, University of	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
Temple University	2	1.7%	1	1.4%
TOTAL	69	57.5%	47	67.1%
IN-STATE, PUBLIC, 2-YEAR				
Harrisburg Area CC	1	0.8%	1	1.4%
Lehigh County CC	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
Luzerne County CC	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
Northampton County Area CC	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
Westmoreland County CC	2	1.7%	0	0.0%
TOTAL	6	5.0%	1	1.4%
IN-STATE, PRIVATE, 4-YEAR				
Bucknell University	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
Carnegie Mellon	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
College Misericordia	2	1.7%	0	0.0%
Drexel University	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
Kings College	2	1.7%	0	0.0%
Lycoming College	13	10.8%	8	11.4%
Marywood College	1	0.8%	1	1.4%
Messiah College	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
Philadelphia College of Textiles & Science	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
Robert Morris College	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
York College	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
TOTAL	23	19.2%	11	15.7%

TABLE 29 (cont'd.)
TRANSFERS BY INSTITUTION
SPRING - FALL 1992

INSTITUTION TYPE/ Institution	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
IN-STATE, PRIVATE, 2-YEAR/PROPRIETARY				
Mt. Aloysius JC	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
Central Penn Business School	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
South Hills Business School	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
Triangle Tech	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
Williamsport School of Commerce	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
Centre County Vo-Tech	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
Geisinger Medical Center	1	0.8%	1	1.4%
Keystone Central Area Vo-Tech	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
Danville Nursing	2	1.7%	0	0.0%
TOTAL	10	8.3%	1	1.4%
TOTAL IN-STATE	108	90.0%	60	85.7%
OUT-OF-STATE				
AK - Alaska, University of	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
CA - American River College	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
IL - DePaul University	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
MD - Allegany CC	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
MD - Maryland, University of	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
MI - Ferris State University	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
NJ - Glassboro State College	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
NY - Alfred University	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
NY - Arnot Ogden School of Nursing	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
NY - Corning CC	4	3.3%	1	1.4%
NY - Rochester Institute of Technology	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
NY - SUNY-Binghamton	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
OH - Ohio State University	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
TX - School of Automotive Machinists	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
WV - Potomac State College of West Virginia	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
WV - West Liberty State College	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
TOTAL OUT-OF-STATE	12	10.0%	10	14.3%
TOTAL	**120**	**100.0%**	**70**	**100.0%**

Filename: Lvrs29wq1
Date: 6/29/93

TABLE 30
TRANSFER PROBLEMS
SPRING - FALL 1992

PROBLEM	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
No Transfer Problems	84	69.4%	46	68.7%
Yes: Transferring Credits	20	16.5%	12	17.9%
Yes: Transcript	10	8.3%	4	6.0%
Yes: Admission	3	2.5%	2	3.0%
Yes: Other	4	3.3%	3	4.5%
TOTAL	121	100.0%	67	100.0%

TABLE 31
TRANSFER CREDITS NOT ACCEPTED
SPRING - FALL 1992

CREDITS LOST	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
All Accepted	28	24.8%	19	28.4%
Lost 1-3	28	24.8%	13	19.4%
Lost 4-6	24	21.2%	13	19.4%
Lost 7-12	13	11.5%	11	16.4%
Lost 13-21	14	12.4%	4	6.0%
Lost More Than 21	6	5.3%	7	10.4%
TOTAL	113	100.0%	67	100.0%

TABLE 32
TRANSFER PREPARATION
SPRING - FALL 1992

PREPARATION	Spring - Fall 1992 N	%	Spring - Fall 1990 N	%
Very Good	29	24.6%	19	28.4%
Good	74	62.7%	42	62.7%
Poor	14	11.9%	6	9.0%
Very Poor	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
TOTAL	118	100.0%	67	100.0%

Filename: Lvrs3032.wq1
Date: 06/29/93

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY (Penn College)
1992 LEAVER FOLLOW-UP

********** SECTION A **********

1. What was your PRIMARY objective in attending our college? (Choose one)
   ___ 1. Upgrading Current Job Skills
   ___ 2. Preparation for First Job
   ___ 3. Retraining for New Job
   ___ 4. Transfer to 4-Year College
   ___ 5. Personal Interest
   ___ 6. Other (describe)_____

2. Use the following list and corresponding numbers to indicate up to three reasons why you did NOT re-enroll at the College.

   Major Reason ____ Second Reason ____ Third Reason ____

   1. Finished Needed Courses
   2. Travel Distance
   3. Enrolled in Another College (transfer)
   4. Satisfactory Employment
   5. Work/Class Time Conflict
   6. Personal Financial Problems
   7. Poor Housing
   8. Relocated (moved)
   9. Grade Problems
   10. Poor Instruction
   11. Course Content
   12. Personal/Family Reasons
   13. Health Problems
   14. Unsatisfactory Advisor/Counselor
   15. Program Unavailable
   16. Unsure Career Goals
   17. Study Time Required
   18. Inconvenient Course Times
   19. Tuition and Costs
   20. Other:_____

3. Which of the following best describes your present employment status? (Choose one)

   ___ 1. Employed Full-Time
   ___ 2. Employed Part-Time
   ___ 3. Unemployed, Seeking Employment
   ___ 4. Military Service
   ___ 5. Continuing Education
   ___ 6. Unavailable for Employment (describe)_____

4. Please rate how satisfied you are with your educational experience at our College? (Choose one)

   ___ 1. Very Disappointed
   ___ 2. Disappointed
   ___ 3. Satisfied
   ___ 4. Very Satisfied

5. How would you rate your level of social satisfaction while attending our college? (Choose one)

   ___ 1. Very Disappointed
   ___ 2. Disappointed
   ___ 3. Satisfied
   ___ 4. Very Satisfied

6. If you have completed courses in your MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY, please rate how well they fulfilled your needs.

	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Not Apply
a. Instructional Quality	___	___	___	___	___
b. Grading/Testing	___	___	___	___	___
c. Instructor Interest	___	___	___	___	___
d. Course Content	___	___	___	___	___
e. Instructional Films/Tapes/etc.	___	___	___	___	___
f. Hands-on Equipment	___	___	___	___	___
g. Class Size	___	___	___	___	___

7. Please rate how well the following college services fulfilled your needs.

	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Does Not Apply
a. Admissions Procedures	___	___	___	___	___
b. Financial Aid Services	___	___	___	___	___
c. Academic Advisement	___	___	___	___	___
d. Computerized Class Scheduling	___	___	___	___	___
e. Billing/Payment Procedures	___	___	___	___	___
f. Welcome Day & Orientation	___	___	___	___	___
g. Tutoring Center	___	___	___	___	___
h. Counseling	___	___	___	___	___
i. Placement/Career Services	___	___	___	___	___
j. Library Services	___	___	___	___	___
k. Bookstore Services/Prices	___	___	___	___	___
l. Cafeteria Services/Prices	___	___	___	___	___
m. Student Activities/Clubs	___	___	___	___	___
n. Intramural Athletics	___	___	___	___	___
o. Parking	___	___	___	___	___
p. Computer Labs	___	___	___	___	___

**********SECTION B**********
EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

1. If you are CURRENTLY EMPLOYED, is the job related to the courses you completed at our College?

   ___ 1. Directly Related
   ___ 2. Indirectly Related
   ___ 3. Not Related

(Over)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. Did the courses taken at our College help you in your occupational area in any way?

___ 1. Helped to Obtain Employment
___ 2. Helped With Job Performance
___ 3. Helped With Job Advancement (promotion/salary raise)
___ 4. Little/No Effect on Job
___ 5. Other (describe)_____

3. Please rate how useful your training at our College has been to your job performance. (Choose one)

___ 1. Of No Use ___ 3. Useful
___ 2. Of Little Use ___ 4. Very Useful

4. Would you recommend the courses you took at our College to others employed in positions similar to yours? (Choose one)

___ 1. Recommend ___ 2. Undecided ___ 3. Not Recommended

5. If you are employed, please complete the following:

Occupation:_____
1. Employer Name:_____
Employer Location:
City_____State____Zip_____

2. County (if in PA)_____

6. If you are employed full-time, provide your gross annual salary (before deductions) to the nearest thousand dollars.

$ _____

********** SECTION C **********
COLLEGE TRANSFER INFORMATION

1. When you enrolled at our College, did you plan to transfer prior to the completion of your program? (Choose one)

___ 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ 3. Unsure

2. What college have your enrolled in?
College Name:_____
City:_____State:_____
Major:_____

3. Did you have problems transferring to the college indicated above? (Choose the biggest problem)

___ 1. No Problems
___ 2. Yes: Transferring Credits
___ 3. Yes: Transcript Problems
___ 4. Yes: Admissions Problems
___ 5. Yes: Other (describe)_____

4. How many credits earned at our College were not accepted at your transfer college? (Choose one)

___ 1. All Credits Accepted ___ 4. Lost 7-12 Credits
___ 2. Lost 1-3 Credits ___ 5. Lost 13-21 Credits
___ 3. Lost 4-6 Credits ___ 6. Lost Over 21 Credits

5. How well did our College prepare you for continuing your education? (Choose one)

___ 1. Very Poorly ___ 3. Well
___ 2. Poorly ___ 4. Very Well

6. What is your current enrollment status and class standing?

A. STATUS
___ 1. Full-Time
___ 2. Part-Time

B. CLASS STANDING
___ 1. Freshman (1st year)
___ 2. Sophomore (2nd year)
___ 3. Junior (3rd year)
___ 4. Senior (4th year)
___ 5. Post-Graduate student

********** SECTION D **********
GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Were the courses taken at our College of any benefit to your career plans? (Choose one)

___ 1. Immediate Direct Benefit
___ 2. Long Term Direct Benefit
___ 3. Indirect Benefit
___ 4. Little/No Benefit

2. Are you interested in taking other courses at our college? (include courses not presently offered by our college)

1. Yes (what courses)_____
2. No

3. What was your employment status while you were enrolled at our college? (Choose one)

___ 1. Unemployed
___ 2. Employed 1-10 Hours/Week
___ 3. Employed 11-20 Hours/Week
___ 4. Employed 21-35 Hours/Week
___ 5. Employed over 35 Hours/Week

****

4. Please comment on how you feel educational programs, courses and student services at the Pennsylvania College of Technology could be improved.

THANK YOU FOR ASSISTING US IN THIS SURVEY. Please return this in the postage-paid envelope by December 15. If you have any questions, call 717-326-3761, extension 7567.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Pennsylvania College of Technology

PENNSTATE

One College Avenue
Williamsport, PA 17701-5799

(717) 326-3761

October 6, 1992

Dear

We at the Pennsylvania College of Technology (Penn College) need your assistance in an evaluation of our programs and services. During the past school year over 3700 students attended the College. However, some students who were eligible to return this Fall decided not to enroll.

We are interested in the reasons why some of our students choose not to continue their education with us. The enclosed questionnaire presents an opportunity for you to grade various aspects of the College and to inform us of your reasons for leaving the College. Sharing your opinions with us is perhaps the most effective way to help us correct any problems and maintain our strengths to benefit future students.

The questionnaire is brief. All information will be kept strictly confidential and will be used only for institutional research. Your name, of course, will never be identified with your individual responses and is printed on the form only to allow us to contact and remind those who do not return the survey.

Please take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope by October 28. If you have any questions concerning this study, please contact Steve Cunningham, Institutional Research Specialist, at 717-326-3761, extension 7567. We appreciate your valuable assistance and wish you the best in your future endeavors.

Sincerely,

Sandra M. Slotnick
Director of Institutional
Research and Planning

Enclosures (2)
Questionnaire
Return Envelope

Pennsylvania College of Technology

PENNSTATE

One College Avenue
Williamsport, PA 17701-5799

(717) 326-3761

November 03, 1992

Dear

Several weeks ago, you received a questionnaire from the Office of Strategic Planning and Research at the Pennsylvania College of Technology (Penn College) asking for your assistance in an evaluation of our programs and services. We are interested in the reasons why some of our students choose not to continue their education with us. The responses we have received have been very encouraging and represent perhaps the most effective way to help us correct any problems and maintain our strengths to benefit future students.

At this time we have not received your response. Would you please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed survey and return it to us in the postage-paid envelope by November 17. All responses will be kept strictly confidential.

WE WILL SOON BEGIN TO TELEPHONE THOSE WHO DO NOT RESPOND TO THIS SURVEY BECAUSE YOUR RESPONSE IS SO IMPORTANT TO US. IF YOU WOULD PREFER, SIMPLY FILL OUT THE ENCLOSED SURVEY, RATHER THAN WAITING FOR US TO TELEPHONE YOU.

If you have any questions concerning this study, please contact Steve Cunningham, Institutional Research Specialist, at 717-326-3761, extension 7567. Thank you for your valuable assistance.

Sincerely,

Sandra M. Slotnick
Director of Institutional
Research and Planning

Enclosures (2)
Questionnaire
Return Envelope

19

Pennsylvania College of Technology

PENNSTATE

One College Avenue
Williamsport, PA 17701-5799

(717) 326-3761

November 20, 1992

Dear

Several weeks ago, you received a questionnaire from the Office of Strategic Planning and Research at the Pennsylvania College of Technology (Penn College) asking for your assistance in an evaluation of our programs and services. We are interested in the reasons why some of our students choose not to continue their education with us. The responses we have received have been very encouraging and represent perhaps the most effective way to help us correct any problems and maintain our strengths to benefit future students.

At this time we have not received your response. Would you please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed survey and return it to us in the postage-paid envelope by December 15. All responses will be kept strictly confidential.

WE WILL SOON BEGIN TO TELEPHONE THOSE WHO DO NOT RESPOND TO THIS SURVEY BECAUSE YOUR RESPONSE IS SO IMPORTANT TO US. IF YOU WOULD PREFER, SIMPLY FILL OUT THE ENCLOSED SURVEY, RATHER THAN WAITING FOR US TO TELEPHONE YOU.

If you have any questions concerning this study, please contact Steve Cunningham, Institutional Research Specialist, at 717-326-3761, extension 7567. Thank you for your valuable assistance.

Sincerely,

Sandra M. Slotnick
Director of Institutional
Research and Planning

Enclosures (2)
Questionnaire
Return Envelope

50